United Nations

FCCC/SBI/2014/21

Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
4 February 2015

Original: English

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Report of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation on its forty-first session, held in Lima from 1 to 8 December 2014

Contents

		Paragraphs	*Page*
I.	Opening of the session (Agenda item 1)	1–2	4
II.	Organizational matters (Agenda item 2)	3–10	4
	A. Adoption of the agenda	3–5	4
	B. Organization of the work of the session	6	6
	C. Multilateral assessment working group session under the international assessment and review process	7–8	7
	D. Election of officers other than the Chair	9–10	7
III.	Reporting from and review of Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (Agenda item 3)	11–17	8
	A. Status of submission and review of sixth national communications and first biennial reports from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention	11	8
	B. Compilation and synthesis of sixth national communications and first biennial reports from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention	12	8
	C. Compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated in sixth national communications from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol	13–14	8
	D. Revision of the "Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part II: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on national communications"	15	9
	E. Report on national greenhouse gas inventory data from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention for the period 1990–2012	16	9
	F. Annual compilation and accounting report for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol for 2014	17	9

GE.15-01871 (E)

1501871

Please recycle

IV.	Reporting from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (Agenda item 4)	18–40	9
	A. Information contained in national communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention *(agenda sub-item held in abeyance)*		9
	B. Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention	18–27	9
	C. Provision of financial and technical support	28–40	11
V.	Work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of nationally appropriate mitigation actions (Agenda item 5)	41–48	13
VI.	Matters relating to the mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol (Agenda item 6)	49–63	14
	A. Review of the modalities and procedures for the clean development mechanism	49–52	14
	B. Review of the joint implementation guidelines	53–55	14
	C. Modalities for expediting the continued issuance, transfer and acquisition of joint implementation emission reduction units	56–59	15
	D. Procedures, mechanisms and institutional arrangements for appeals against decisions of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism	60–62	16
	E. Report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol	63	16
VII.	Matters relating to the least developed countries (Agenda item 7)	64–74	16
VIII.	Report of the Adaptation Committee (Agenda item 8)	75	17
IX.	National adaptation plans (Agenda item 9)	76–79	18
X.	Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts (Agenda item 10)	80–81	18
XI.	Matters relating to finance (Agenda item 11)	82–83	19
	A. Second review of the Adaptation Fund	82	19
	B. Further guidance to the Least Developed Countries Fund	83	19
XII.	Development and transfer of technologies and implementation of the Technology Mechanism (Agenda item 12)	84–88	20
	A. Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network	84	20
	B. Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer	85–88	20
XIII.	Capacity-building (Agenda item 13)	89–98	21
	A. Capacity-building under the Convention	89–93	21

	B. Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol	94–98	21
XIV.	Impact of the implementation of response measures (Agenda item 14)	99–105	22
	A. Forum and work programme	99–103	22
	B. Matters relating to Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol	104	23
	C. Progress on the implementation of decision 1/CP.10	105	23
XV.	The 2013–2015 review (Agenda item 15)	106–118	24
XVI.	Gender and climate change (Agenda item 16)	119–120	25
XVII.	Arrangements for intergovernmental meetings (Agenda item 17)	121–132	26
XVIII.	Administrative, financial and institutional matters (Agenda item 18)	133–134	27
	A. Audited financial statements for the biennium 2012–2013	133	27
	B. Budget performance for the biennium 2014–2015	134	27
XIX.	Reports on other activities (Agenda item 19)	135–136	28
	A. Report on the expert meeting on an information hub for information on the results of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and results-based payments	135	28
	B. Summary report on the 2nd Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention	136	28
XX.	Other matters (Agenda item 20)	137–139	28
XXI.	Closure of and report on the session (Agenda item 21)	140–145	29
Annexes			
I.	Summary reports on multilateral assessments at the forty-first session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation		30
II.	Statement made by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at the resumed 2nd meeting on the outcome of his consultations on the issue of membership on the Consultative Group of Experts		49

I. Opening of the session

(Agenda item 1)

1. The forty-first session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) was held at the United Nations Climate Change Conference, Lima, Peru, from 1 to 8 December 2014.

2. The Chair of the SBI, Mr. Amena Yauvoli (Fiji), opened the session on Monday, 1 December, and welcomed all Parties and observers. He also welcomed Mr. Ilhomjon Rajabov (Tajikistan) as Vice-Chair of the SBI and Ms. Mabafokeng Mahahabisa (Lesotho) as Rapporteur.

II. Organizational matters

(Agenda item 2)

A. Adoption of the agenda

(Agenda sub-item 2(a))

3. At its 1st meeting, on 1st December, the SBI considered a note by the Executive Secretary containing the provisional agenda and annotations (FCCC/SBI/2014/9).

4. At the same meeting, the agenda was adopted as follows, with agenda sub-item 4(a) held in abeyance, and on the understanding that the issue of membership on the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE), referred to the SBI by the Conference of the Parties (COP), would be considered under agenda item 20 ("Other matters"):

1. Opening of the session.
2. Organizational matters:
   - (a) Adoption of the agenda;
   - (b) Organization of the work of the session;
   - (c) Multilateral assessment working group session under the international assessment and review process;
   - (d) Election of officers other than the Chair.
3. Reporting from and review of Parties included in Annex I to the Convention:
   - (a) Status of submission and review of sixth national communications and first biennial reports from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention;
   - (b) Compilation and synthesis of sixth national communications and first biennial reports from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention;
   - (c) Compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated in sixth national communications from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol;
   - (d) Revision of the "Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part II: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on national communications";

(e) Report on national greenhouse gas inventory data from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention for the period 1990–2012;

(f) Annual compilation and accounting report for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol for 2014.

4. Reporting from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention:

(a) Information contained in national communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (*agenda sub-item held in abeyance*);

(b) Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention;

(c) Provision of financial and technical support.

5. Work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of nationally appropriate mitigation actions.

6. Matters relating to the mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol:

(a) Review of the modalities and procedures for the clean development mechanism;

(b) Review of the joint implementation guidelines;

(c) Modalities for expediting the continued issuance, transfer and acquisition of joint implementation emission reduction units;

(d) Procedures, mechanisms and institutional arrangements for appeals against decisions of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism;

(e) Report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol.

7. Matters relating to the least developed countries.

8. Report of the Adaptation Committee.

9. National adaptation plans.

10. Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts.

11. Matters relating to finance:

(a) Second review of the Adaptation Fund;

(b) Further guidance to the Least Developed Countries Fund.

12. Development and transfer of technologies and implementation of the Technology Mechanism:

(a) Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network;

(b) Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer.

13. Capacity-building:

(a) Capacity-building under the Convention;

(b) Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol.

14. Impact of the implementation of response measures:

(a) Forum and work programme;

(b) Matters relating to Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol;

(c) Progress on the implementation of decision 1/CP.10.

15. The 2013–2015 review.

16. Gender and climate change.

17. Arrangements for intergovernmental meetings.

18. Administrative, financial and institutional matters:

(a) Audited financial statements for the biennium 2012–2013;

(b) Budget performance for the biennium 2014–2015.

19. Reports on other activities:

(a) Report on the expert meeting on an information hub for information on the results of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and results-based payments;

(b) Summary report on the 2nd Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention.

20. Other matters.

21. Closure of and report on the session.

5. At the 1st meeting, statements were made by representatives of 13 Parties, including one on behalf of the Group of 77 and China (G77 and China), one on behalf of the Umbrella Group, one on behalf of the Environmental Integrity Group (EIG), two on behalf of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS),[1] one on behalf of the African Group, one on behalf of the European Union and its 28 member States, one on behalf of the least developed countries (LDCs), one on behalf of the Independent Association for Latin America and the Caribbean, one on behalf of the Central American Integration System, and one on behalf of the Coalition for Rainforest Nations. Statements were also made on behalf of business and industry non-governmental organizations (NGOs), indigenous peoples organizations, women and gender NGOs, youth NGOs, and by representatives of environmental NGOs.[2]

B. Organization of the work of the session

(Agenda sub-item 2(b))

6. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting, at which the Chair drew attention to the proposed programme of work posted on the SBI 41 webpage.[3] He reminded the SBI that the first part of the SBI closing plenary meeting had been scheduled for the afternoon of Friday, 5 December, to allow the SBI to adopt conclusions on all substantive items before the launch of the multilateral assessment (MA) working group session on Saturday, 6 December. He also reminded Parties that the second part of the SBI closing

[1] Including one statement on issues relating to agenda item 6 ("Matters relating to the mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol").

[2] The texts of statements, including those that could not be delivered during the plenary meeting owing to the lack of time, are available on the submission portal at <www.unfccc.int/5900> (select SBI, then search for "statements").

[3] <www.unfccc.int/8500>.

plenary would be held immediately after the completion of the MA process, in the late afternoon on Monday, 8 December. In line with previously adopted SBI conclusions[4] on the timely conclusion of negotiations and related working practices, the Chair informed the SBI that no meetings will be organized after 6 p.m. On a proposal by the Chair, the SBI agreed to proceed on the basis of the programme of work referred to above.

C. Multilateral assessment working group session under the international assessment and review process

(Agenda sub-item 2(c))

Proceedings

7. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting and took note of the information provided by the Chair on the organization of the first MA working group session, which was to be convened on 6 and 8 December 2014.

8. A summary report for each of the 17 Parties that underwent assessment at SBI 41 is available on the UNFCCC website under those Parties' records,[5] and is also presented in annex I.

D. Election of officers other than the Chair

(Agenda sub-item 2(d))

Proceedings

9. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting, as well as at its 2nd meeting, on 5 December. At the 1st meeting, the Chair recalled rule 27 of the draft rules of procedure being applied, whereby the SBI is expected to elect its Vice-Chair and Rapporteur. At the same meeting, the SBI noted that the consultations on the nominations of the SBI Vice-Chair and Rapporteur are being coordinated with the consultations being conducted on the nominations to all other bodies under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol by Mr. Cheikh Ndiaye Sylla (Senegal), Vice-President of the COP and the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP), under the authority of the President of the COP and the CMP.

10. At the 2nd meeting, the Chair informed Parties that nominations for the post of Vice-Chair had not been received. As an exception to rule 27, paragraph 4, of the draft rules of procedure being applied, the SBI invited the COP to elect the Vice-Chair and the Rapporteur of the SBI at the closing plenary of COP 20.[6]

[4] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraphs 218–221.

[5] See <www.unfccc.int/8451>.

[6] The COP elected Mr. Guoshun Sun (China) as Vice-Chair and Mr. Sidat Yaffa (Gambia) as Rapporteur, who will serve at SBI 42 and 43 (FCCC/CP/2014/10, para. 52).

III. Reporting from and review of Parties included in Annex I to the Convention

(Agenda item 3)

A. Status of submission and review of sixth national communications and first biennial reports from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention

(Agenda sub-item 3(a))

Proceedings

11. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting and took note of the information contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.19.

B. Compilation and synthesis of sixth national communications and first biennial reports from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention

(Agenda sub-item 3(b))

Proceedings

12. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.20 and Add.1 and 2. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Fatuma Hussein (Kenya) and Ms. Helen Plume (New Zealand). At the 2nd meeting, the Chair reported that the consultations did not result in any conclusions. In accordance with rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure being applied, this matter will be included in the provisional agenda for SBI 42 (June 2015).

C. Compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated in sixth national communications from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol

(Agenda sub-item 3(c))

1. Proceedings

13. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.21. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Hussein and Ms. Plume. At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[7]

2. Conclusions

14. The SBI welcomed the compilation and synthesis of supplementary information incorporated in sixth national communications from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention (Annex I Parties) that are also Parties to the Kyoto Protocol[8] and took note thereof.

[7] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.30.

[8] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.21.

D. Revision of the "Guidelines for the preparation of national communications by Parties included in Annex I to the Convention, Part II: UNFCCC reporting guidelines on national communications"

(Agenda sub-item 3(d))

Proceedings

15. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/TP/2014/5. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Hussein and Ms. Plume. At the 2nd meeting, the Chair reported that the consultations did not result in any conclusions. In accordance with rule rules 10(c) and 16 of the draft rules of procedure being applied, this matter will be included in the provisional agenda for SBI 42.

E. Report on national greenhouse gas inventory data from Parties included in Annex I to the Convention for the period 1990–2012

(Agenda sub-item 3(e))

Proceedings

16. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting and took note of the information contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/20.

F. Annual compilation and accounting report for Annex B Parties under the Kyoto Protocol for 2014

(Agenda sub-item 3(f))

Proceedings

17. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting. It recommended that the CMP take note of the information contained in document FCCC/KP/CMP/2014/7 and Add.1.

IV. Reporting from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

(Agenda item 4)

A. Information contained in national communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

(Agenda sub-item 4(a) *held in abeyance*)

B. Work of the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

(Agenda sub-item 4(b))

1. Proceedings

18. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SBI/2014/17, FCCC/SBI/2014/18, FCCC/SBI/2014/19,

FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.15 and FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.16. At its 1st meeting,[9] the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Plume and Ms. Lilian Portillo (Paraguay). At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[10]

2. Conclusions

19. The SBI noted the progress reports[11] of the CGE and the work programme of the CGE for the period 2014–2018.[12] The SBI commended the CGE for developing and implementing its work programme. It also thanked the Annex I Parties[13] that have made financial contributions for the implementation of the work of the CGE in 2014.

20. The SBI welcomed the progress made by the CGE in implementing its activities, including the following:

(a) The compilation of information in a technical report[14] on problems and constraints, as well as lessons learned and best practices, in the process of and the preparation of national communications and biennial update reports (BURs) by Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (non-Annex I Parties). The SBI encouraged the CGE to take into consideration the relevant elements identified in that report in the implementation of its work programme, as appropriate;

(b) The organization of two regional training workshops on the preparation of BURs from non-Annex I Parties.[15] The SBI expressed its gratitude to the Governments of Panama and Armenia for hosting the workshops. It encouraged the CGE to make every effort to conduct the remaining regional training workshop, for the African region, in the first quarter of 2015;

(c) The translation of the supplementary CGE training materials on the preparation of BURs into Arabic, French and Spanish. The SBI requested the secretariat to make arrangements, subject to the availability of financial resources, for the translation of the training materials into the other official United Nations languages in 2015;[16]

(d) The development of the CGE e-learning programme on the preparation of national communications from non-Annex I Parties, which is based on the updated CGE training materials.[17] The SBI encouraged non-Annex I Parties to make use of the e-learning programme and to encourage national experts to participate in the programme.

21. The SBI also welcomed the progress made in the development of the training programme for the team of technical experts undertaking the technical analysis of BURs under the international consultation and analysis process, and extended its appreciation to the experts who engaged in the peer review of the materials for the training programme.[18] It encouraged the CGE to finalize the training materials by the first quarter of 2015.

---

[9] A statement by the Chair of the CGE on this agenda sub-item is available at <www.unfccc.int/8500>.

[10] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.26.

[11] FCCC/SBI/2014/17, FCCC/SBI/2014/18, FCCC/SBI/2014/19, FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.15 and FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.16.

[12] FCCC/SBI/2014/17, annex I.

[13] Belgium, Canada, European Union and Japan.

[14] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.16.

[15] The report on the two workshops is contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/18.

[16] The translated materials are available at <http://unfccc.int/7915.php>.

[17] The updated CGE training materials on the preparation of national communications are available at <http://unfccc.int/349.php>.

[18] The report on the workshop on the peer review of the materials for the training of the team of technical experts is contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/19.

22. The SBI further welcomed the long-term strategy (2015–2018) of the CGE,[19] which outlines strategies to enhance the provision of technical assistance to non-Annex I Parties in a more effective, adequate and sustainable manner at the regional, subregional and national levels. The SBI noted that the strategy provides a good basis for the CGE to deliver its mandate in a comprehensive manner and encouraged the CGE to take into consideration the relevant elements of the strategy in revising and implementing its work programme.

23. The SBI, recalling decision 20/CP.19, paragraph 2, encouraged Parties to nominate, as early as possible, technical experts with the relevant qualifications to the UNFCCC roster of experts. It also encouraged the CGE to organize, as early as possible in 2015, training for the nominated technical experts, as requested in paragraph 4 of the same decision.

24. The SBI noted the plans of the CGE to initiate the revision of its updated training materials on vulnerability and adaptation assessments during the first half of 2015 and to organize the regional hands-on training workshops on vulnerability and adaptation assessments in the second half of 2015, subject to the availability of financial resources.

25. The SBI urged developed country Parties included in Annex II to the Convention and other developed country Parties in a position to do so to provide financial resources to enable the CGE to implement the activities planned in its work programme. In addition, it invited multilateral programmes and organizations to collaborate with the CGE, as appropriate, in the provision of technical support to non-Annex I Parties for preparing their national communications and BURs.

26. The SBI took note of the estimated budgetary implications of the activities to be undertaken by the CGE, with the assistance of the secretariat, including those referred to in paragraphs 20–24 above.[20]

27. It requested that the actions of the secretariat called for in these conclusions be undertaken subject to the availability of financial resources.

C. Provision of financial and technical support
(Agenda sub-item 4(c))

1. Proceedings

28. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.12, FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.22 and FCCC/CP/2014/2. At its 1st meeting,[21] the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Plume and Ms. Portillo. At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusion below.[22]

2. Conclusions

29. The SBI took note of the information provided by the secretariat of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on the financial support provided by the GEF for the preparation of national communications and BURs by non-Annex I Parties.[23]

---

[19] The long-term strategy (2015–2018) of the CGE is contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.15.

[20] The estimated resource requirements to implement the CGE work programme for 2015–2018 are contained in annex II to document FCCC/SBI/2014/17.

[21] A statement by a representative of the Global Environment Facility on this agenda sub-item is available at <www.unfccc.int/8500>.

[22] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.29.

[23] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.22 and FCCC/CP/2014/2.

30. The SBI invited the GEF to continue providing detailed, accurate, timely and complete information on its activities relating to the preparation of national communications by non-Annex I Parties, including information on the dates of approvals of funding and disbursement of funds. It also invited the GEF to continue providing information on an approximate date of completion of the draft national communications and an approximate date of submission to the secretariat of the national communications, for consideration at SBI 43 (November–December 2015).

31. The SBI further invited the GEF to continue providing detailed, accurate, timely and complete information on its activities relating to the preparation of BURs, including information on the dates of requests for funding, approvals of funding and disbursement of funds, as well as an approximate date of submission to the secretariat of the BURs, for consideration at SBI 42.

32. The SBI noted the information provided by the GEF, in its report to COP 20,[24] on the funding available to non-Annex I Parties for the preparation of their national communications and BURs under its latest replenishment, and on the total amount of funding available in its climate change focal area.

33. The SBI also noted that, by 4 December 2014, one non-Annex I Party had submitted its first BUR in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 41(a), and that a further seven non-Annex I Parties are expected to submit them by 31 December 2014. It further noted that, as at 1 December 2014, the GEF secretariat had received 48 requests from non-Annex I Parties for funds for the preparation of their BURs. In addition, the SBI noted that the GEF Council approved, in October 2014, a project for 35 small island developing States and LDCs to complete their BURs.

34. Recalling decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 41(d), the SBI reiterated its urging of the non-Annex I Parties that have yet to submit, as applicable, their requests to the GEF for support for the preparation of their first BURs to do so in a timely manner.[25] In addition, it encouraged GEF agencies to continue to facilitate the preparation and submission of project proposals by non-Annex I Parties for the preparation of their BURs.

35. The SBI invited the GEF to provide, in its report to COP 21 (November–December 2015), information on the procedures available to facilitate access by non-Annex I Parties to funding for the preparation of their national communications and multiple BURs with one application.

36. The SBI noted the progress made by the GEF in the operationalization of its Global Support Programme (GSP).[26] It encouraged non-Annex I Parties to take advantage of the opportunities for technical assistance and support available under the GSP.

37. The SBI welcomed the report[27] provided by the secretariat on the regional hands-on training workshops on the use of the national greenhouse gas inventory software for non-Annex I Parties, which were held in the period 2013–2014. Noting the need to train additional experts, it requested the secretariat to make all efforts to provide further relevant training, once the updated software has been made available in other United Nations languages.

38. The SBI noted with appreciation that, as at 4 December 2014, 147 initial, 105 second, 9 third, 1 fourth and 1 fifth national communications from non-Annex I Parties had

[24] FCCC/CP/2014/2.

[25] FCCC/SBI/2012/15, paragraph 53.

[26] A project administered jointly by the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme with the objective of enhancing the support provided to non-Annex I Parties for the timely preparation of their national communications and BURs.

[27] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.12.

been submitted. It also noted that it is expected that, by the end of 2014, 20 second and 11 third national communications from non-Annex I Parties will have been submitted.

39. The SBI took note of the estimated budgetary implications of the activities to be undertaken by the secretariat referred to in paragraph 37 above.

40. It requested that the actions of the secretariat called for in these conclusions be undertaken subject to the availability of financial resources.

V. Work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of nationally appropriate mitigation actions

(Agenda item 5)

1. Proceedings

41. The SBI considered this agenda item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.11 and FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.24. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Ann Gan (Singapore) and Mr. Dimitar Nikov (France). At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[28]

2. Conclusions

42. The SBI concluded the work programme to further the understanding of the diversity of nationally appropriate mitigation actions (NAMAs), established pursuant to decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 19 (hereinafter referred to as the work programme).

43. The SBI noted the activities implemented during the work programme:

(a) The compilation of information on NAMAs to be implemented by developing country Parties;[29]

(b) The in-session workshops held at SBI 39 and SBI 40 and the reports thereon;[30]

(c) The first and second reports on the extent of the matching of mitigation actions with financial, technical and capacity-building support under the NAMA registry;[31]

(d) The annual regional capacity-building workshops to facilitate the preparation and implementation of NAMAs.[32]

44. The SBI acknowledged that information and experiences shared under the work programme, both on NAMAs and on the provision of support for NAMAs, furthered the understanding of the diversity of NAMAs.

45. The SBI also acknowledged the value of information relating to NAMAs, as specified in decision 2/CP.17, paragraphs 33 and 34, including underlying assumptions and methodologies, sectors and gases covered, global warming potential values used and estimated mitigation outcomes, provided under the work programme.

46. The SBI recognized the existence of needs for financial, technology and capacity-building support for the preparation and implementation of specific measurable, reportable

[28] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.36.
[29] FCCC/SBI/2013/INF.12/Rev.2.
[30] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.1 and FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.11.
[31] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.10 and FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.24.
[32] Available at <http://unfccc.int/focus/mitigation/items/7429.php>.

and verifiable NAMAs, as well as of support available and provided, access modalities and related experience gained.

47. The SBI acknowledged that the matching of mitigation actions with financial, technology and capacity-building support in the NAMA registry has started to occur.[33]

48. The SBI requested the secretariat to ensure the sound operation of the NAMA registry, with a view to facilitating both the recording of information on NAMAs and support for them, as well as the matching of NAMAs with support.

VI. Matters relating to the mechanisms under the Kyoto Protocol

(Agenda item 6)

A. Review of the modalities and procedures for the clean development mechanism

(Agenda sub-item 6(a))

1. Proceedings

49. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. A representative of one Party made a statement on behalf of AOSIS. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Marko Berglund (Finland) and Mr. Giza Gaspar Martins (Angola). At the 2nd meeting, the Chair thanked Mr. Jeffery Spooner (Jamaica) for accepting to co-facilitate the consultations in place of Mr. Martins, who was unable to attend the session. At the same meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[34]

2. Conclusions

50. In accordance with decision 4/CMP.9, the SBI continued its consideration of possible changes to the modalities and procedures for the clean development mechanism (CDM).

51. The SBI took note of the technical paper[35] on possible changes to the CDM modalities and procedures, prepared by the secretariat in accordance with decision 4/CMP.9, and of the views[36] submitted by Parties related to this agenda sub-item.

52. The SBI agreed to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 42.

B. Review of the joint implementation guidelines

(Agenda sub-item 6(b))

1. Proceedings

53. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. A representative of one Party made a statement on behalf of AOSIS. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to

[33] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.24.

[34] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.35.

[35] FCCC/TP/2014/1.

[36] Submissions made in 2013 are compiled in document FCCC/SBI/2013/MISC.1 and Add.1, while submissions made in 2014 (for SBI 40 and 41) are available at <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/SitePages/sessions.aspx?showOnlyCurrentCalls=1&populateData=1&expectedsubmissionfrom=Parties&focalBodies=SBI>.

consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Nikov and Mr. Yaw Osafo (Ghana). At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[37]

2. Conclusions

54. The SBI continued its consideration of the review of the guidelines for the implementation of Article 6 of the Kyoto Protocol[38] (joint implementation guidelines), in accordance with decision 6/CMP.8, paragraphs 14–16.

55. The SBI agreed to continue its consideration of this matter at SBI 42, on the basis of the draft decision text and its appendix proposed by the co-facilitators of the informal consultations on this agenda sub-item and contained in the annex to document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.34, with a view to recommending a draft decision on the matter for consideration and adoption at CMP 11 (November–December 2015).

C. Modalities for expediting the continued issuance, transfer and acquisition of joint implementation emission reduction units

(Agenda sub-item 6(c))

1. Proceedings

56. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/TP/2014/4. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Nikov and Mr. Osafo. At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[39]

2. Conclusions

57. The SBI continued its consideration of modalities for expediting the continued issuance, transfer and acquisition of joint implementation emission reduction units, in accordance with decision 1/CMP.8, paragraph 16.

58. The SBI took note with appreciation of the technical paper prepared by the secretariat concerning the technical implications for the processes and systems under the Kyoto Protocol[40] arising from the draft modalities for expediting the continued issuance, transfer and acquisition of joint implementation emission reduction units contained in the annex to document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.9.

59. The SBI was unable to conclude discussions, and agreed to continue discussing this matter at SBI 42.

[37] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.34.
[38] Annex to decision 9/CMP.1.
[39] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.33.
[40] FCCC/TP/2014/4.

D. Procedures, mechanisms and institutional arrangements for appeals against decisions of the Executive Board of the clean development mechanism

(Agenda sub-item 6(d))

1. Proceedings

60. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Osafo and Mr. Kunihiko Shimada (Japan). At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[41]

2. Conclusions

61. The SBI continued its discussion of the issue of procedures, mechanisms and institutional arrangements for appeals against the decisions of the Executive Board of the CDM, in accordance with the mandate set out in decision 3/CMP.6, paragraph 18.

62. The SBI agreed to continue its consideration of this matter on the basis of, inter alia, the co-facilitators' draft text contained in document FCCC/SBI/2012/33/Add.1 at SBI 42, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration at CMP 12 (November 2016).

E. Report of the administrator of the international transaction log under the Kyoto Protocol

(Agenda sub-item 6(e))

Proceedings

63. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting and took note of document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.18.

VII. Matters relating to the least developed countries

(Agenda item 7)

1. Proceedings

64. The SBI considered this agenda item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/SBI/2014/13. At its 1st meeting,[42] the SBI agreed to consider this agenda item in informal consultations facilitated by Mr. Collin Beck (Solomon Islands). At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[43]

2. Conclusions

65. The SBI took note of the report provided by the Chair of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) on the implementation of the LEG work programme for 2014–2015.[44]

---

[41] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.31.

[42] A written statement by the Chair of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group on this agenda item is available at <www.unfccc.int/8500>.

[43] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.24.

[44] The report is available at <http://unfccc.int/8500>.

66. The SBI welcomed the report on the 26th meeting of the LEG,[45] held in Bonn, Germany, from 4 to 7 August 2014, and the outcome of the NAP Expo,[46] also held in Bonn, on 8 and 9 August 2014.

67. The SBI acknowledged the progress made by the LEG under its work programme for 2014–2015 and welcomed the launch of the regional training workshops on national adaptation plans (NAPs) for the LDCs for 2014–2015.[47]

68. The SBI expressed its appreciation to the Governments of Belgium, Canada, Finland, Ireland and Norway for providing financial support for the work of the LEG.

69. The SBI noted with appreciation the contributions made by some Parties to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), with cumulative pledges amounting to USD 906.64 million as at 30 June 2014,[48] and encouraged other Parties also to contribute, recognizing the importance of supporting the full implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs).

70. The SBI welcomed the submission of proposals to the LDCF for the funding of the implementation of NAPA projects. It noted with appreciation that, as at 30 June 2014, 48 countries had accessed USD 823.95 million for 146 projects to implement NAPAs.[49]

71. The SBI invited the GEF to continue to explore ways of simplifying access to the LDCF.

72. The SBI took note of the preparations undertaken by the LEG for the meeting to take stock of its work referred to in decision 6/CP.16, paragraph 9(a).

73. The SBI requested that the LEG keep it informed of the efforts of the LEG in implementing its work programme for 2014–2015.

74. The SBI invited Parties in a position to do so to continue to provide support for the implementation of the LEG work programme.

VIII. Report of the Adaptation Committee

(Agenda item 8)

Proceedings

75. The SBI considered this agenda item at its 1st meeting, as well as at its resumed 2nd meeting, on 5 December 2014. It had before it document FCCC/SB/2014/2. A representative of one Party made a statement on behalf of AOSIS. At its 1st meeting,[50] the SBI agreed to consider this agenda item together with agenda item 4 of the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA) in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Makoto Kato (Japan) and Ms. Jimena Nieto (Colombia). At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and recommended a draft decision[51] on this matter for consideration and adoption at COP 20.[52]

---

[45] FCCC/SBI/2014/13.

[46] Information on the NAP Expo is available at <http://unfccc.int/8425>.

[47] Information on the workshops is available at <http://unfccc.int/6989.php#NAPs>.

[48] FCCC/CP/2014/2, annex, paragraph 110.

[49] As footnote 48 above.

[50] A written statement by the Chair of the Adaptation Committee on this agenda item is available at <www.unfccc.int/8500>.

[51] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SB/2014/L.7.

[52] For the text as adopted, see decision 4/CP.20.

IX. National adaptation plans

(Agenda item 9)

1. Proceedings

76. The SBI considered this agenda item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SBI/2014/13, FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.14, FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.25, FCCC/SB/2014/2 and FCCC/CP/2014/2. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Beck and Mr. Tomasz Chruszczow (Poland). At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[53]

2. Conclusions

77. The SBI welcomed the information submitted by Parties on their experiences with the application of the initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs, as well as information relevant to the formulation and implementation of NAPs provided by Parties and relevant organizations through their submissions.[54]

78. The SBI also welcomed the documents prepared for the session, including the following:

(a) Information paper on experiences, good practices, lessons learned, gaps and needs in the process to formulate and implement NAPs;[55]

(b) Information paper on the NAP process.[56]

79. The SBI recommended a draft decision[57] on NAPs for consideration and adoption at COP 20.[58]

X. Warsaw International Mechanism for Loss and Damage associated with Climate Change Impacts

(Agenda item 10)

1. Proceedings

80. The SBI considered this agenda item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/SB/2014/4. Statements were made by representatives of three Parties, including one on behalf of the LDCs. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda item together with agenda item 7 of the SBSTA in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Beth Lavender (Canada) and Mr. Alf Wills (South Africa). At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[59]

---

[53] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.42.

[54] FCCC/SBI/2014/MISC.1.

[55] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.14.

[56] FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.25.

[57] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.42/Add.1.

[58] For the text as adopted, see decision 3/CP.20.

[59] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SB/2014/L.8.

2. Conclusions

81. The SBSTA and the SBI agreed to recommend that COP 20 continue consideration of this matter on the basis of the text contained in the annex to document FCCC/SB/2014/L.8.[60]

XI. Matters relating to finance
(Agenda item 11)

A. Second review of the Adaptation Fund
(Agenda sub-item 11(a))

Proceedings

82. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SBI/2014/MISC.4 and FCCC/TP/2014/7. A representative of one Party made a statement. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Ana Fornells de Frutos (Spain) and Ms. Suzanty Sitorus (Indonesia). At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI recommended a draft decision[61] on this matter for consideration and adoption at CMP 10.[62]

B. Further guidance to the Least Developed Countries Fund
(Agenda sub-item 11(b))

Proceedings

83. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.17, FCCC/SBI/2014/MISC.3 and FCCC/CP/2014/2. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Kamal Djemouai (Algeria) and Mr. Herman Sips (Netherlands). At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI recommended a draft decision[63] on this matter for consideration and adoption at COP 20.[64]

[60] For the text as adopted, see decision 2/CP.20.
[61] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.39.
[62] For the text as adopted, see decision 2/CMP.10
[63] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.38.
[64] For the text as adopted, see decision 10/CP.20.

XII. Development and transfer of technologies and implementation of the Technology Mechanism
(Agenda item 12)

A. Joint annual report of the Technology Executive Committee and the Climate Technology Centre and Network
(Agenda sub-item 12(a))

Proceedings

84 The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/SB/2014/3. At its 1st meeting,[65] the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item together with agenda item 5 of the SBSTA in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Carlos Fuller (Belize) and Ms. Elfriede More (Austria). At its 2nd meeting, the SBI recommended a draft decision[66] for consideration and adoption at COP 20.[67]

B. Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer
(Agenda sub-item 12(b))

1. Proceedings

85. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SB/2014/3 and FCCC/CP/2014/2 and Add.1. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Fuller and Ms. More. At its 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[68]

2. Conclusions

86. The SBI welcomed the report of the GEF on the progress made in carrying out the Poznan strategic programme on technology transfer.[69]

87. The SBI noted the consultations between the GEF and the Advisory Board of the Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN) and the progress made on aligning the implementation of the element of the Poznan strategic programme related to support for climate technology centres and a climate technology network with the operationalization and activities of the CTCN, which were carried out in response to an invitation from SBI 40.[70] It also noted the areas of collaboration[71] between the regional technology transfer and finance centres supported by the GEF under the Poznan strategic programme and the CTCN and invited the GEF to report on this collaboration as part of its future progress reports.

88. The SBI noted that the Technology Executive Committee (TEC), in response to an invitation from SBI 40[72] to evaluate the Poznan strategic programme, initiated its

[65] Written statements by the Chair of the TEC and the Chair of the Advisory board of the CTCN on this agenda sub-item are available at <www.unfccc.int/8500>.
[66] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SB/2014/L.5.
[67] For the text as adopted, see decision 17/CP.20.
[68] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.32.
[69] FCCC/CP/2014/2, annex, part II.4, and FCCC/CP/2014/2/Add.1.
[70] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 141.
[71] FCCC/CP/2014/2/Add.1, annex, paragraph 14.
[72] FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 142.

deliberations on this matter at its 9th meeting, held in Bonn in August 2014.[73] The SBI also noted that the TEC will undertake the evaluation of the Poznan strategic programme in 2015, guided by the terms of reference to be developed by its task force on this matter. It invited the TEC to provide an interim report on its preliminary findings to SBI 42 and a final report to the COP through SBI 43.

XIII. Capacity-building

(Agenda item 13)

A. Capacity-building under the Convention

(Agenda sub-item 13(a))

1. Proceedings

89. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/SBI/2014/14. Statements were made by representatives of two Parties: one on behalf of the G77 and China and one on behalf of AOSIS. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Bubu Jallow (Gambia) and Ms. Ulrika Raab (Sweden). At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[74]

2. Conclusions

90. The SBI welcomed the summary report on the 3rd meeting of the Durban Forum for in-depth discussion on capacity-building held at SBI 40.[75]

91. The SBI invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 18 February 2015, as part of their annual submissions pursuant to decision 4/CP.12, their views on specific thematic issues relating to capacity-building under the Convention in developing countries, to be considered at the 4th meeting of the Durban Forum on capacity-building, to be held at SBI 42, as well as their views on the organization of that meeting.

92. The SBI also invited Parties to submit, by the same date, their views on the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries, to be initiated at SBI 42, with a view to completing the review at COP 22 (November 2016).[76]

93. The SBI continued, but did not conclude, its consideration of capacity-building for developing countries under the Convention. It agreed to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 42, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption at COP 21.

B. Capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol

(Agenda sub-item 13(b))

1. Proceedings

94. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/SBI/2014/14. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this

[73] FCCC/SB/2014/3, paragraph 50.
[74] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.40.
[75] FCCC/SBI/2014/14.
[76] Decision 13/CP.17.

agenda sub-item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Mr. Jallow and Ms. Raab. At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[77]

2. Conclusions

95. The SBI welcomed the summary report on the 3rd meeting of the Durban Forum on capacity-building.[78]

96. The SBI invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 18 February 2015, as part of their annual submissions pursuant to decision 6/CMP.2, their views on specific thematic issues relating to capacity-building under the Kyoto Protocol in developing countries, to be considered at the 4th meeting of the Durban Forum on capacity-building, to be held at SBI 42, as well as their views on the organization of that meeting.

97. The SBI also invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by the same date, their views on the terms of reference for the third comprehensive review of the implementation of the framework for capacity-building in developing countries established under decision 2/CP.7. The review is to be initiated at SBI 42, with a view to it being completed at CMP 12.[79]

98. The SBI continued, but did not conclude, its consideration of capacity-building for developing countries under the Kyoto Protocol. It agreed to continue its consideration of the matter at SBI 42, with a view to recommending a draft decision for consideration and adoption at CMP 11.

XIV. Impact of the implementation of response measures
(Agenda item 14)

A. Forum and work programme
(Agenda sub-item 14(a))

1. Proceedings

99. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SB/2014/INF.4 and FCCC/TP/2014/12. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item jointly with agenda sub-item 9(a) of the SBSTA in a contact group co-chaired by the Chair of the SBI, Mr. Yauvoli, and the Chair of the SBSTA, Mr. Emmanuel Dumisani Dlamini (Swaziland). The SBI also agreed to consider this agenda sub-item, at this session, jointly with agenda sub-items 14(b) and (c).

100. At the resumed 2nd meeting, the Chair thanked Mr. Eduardo Calvo Buendia (Peru) and Mr. Delano Verwey (Netherlands), who helped him and the SBSTA Chair to facilitate the informal consultations on this agenda sub-item. At the same meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[80]

[77] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.41.
[78] FCCC/SBI/2014/14.
[79] In line with decision 15/CMP.7, paragraph 8.
[80] The draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SB/2014/L.6 were adopted as orally revised in plenary. The draft conclusions as orally revised are presented in document FCCC/SB/2014/L.6/Rev.1.

2. Conclusions

101. The SBI and the SBSTA took note of the submissions made by Parties[81] and relevant organizations[82] on options to strengthen opportunities for cooperation and collaboration among Parties related to this joint agenda sub-item.

102. The SBI and the SBSTA considered the technical paper,[83] prepared by the secretariat, on areas of convergence related to areas of cooperation, as well as the synthesis paper,[84] both based on the reports on the work of the forum, the submissions made by Parties and relevant organizations, presentations and statements made and the review of the work of the forum, without prejudice to the consideration by the COP referred to in paragraph 103 below.

103. The SBI and the SBSTA could not conclude their consideration of this item and agreed to recommend that COP 20 continue consideration of this matter,[85] on the basis of the text contained in the annex to document FCCC/SB/2014/L.6/Rev.1.

B. Matters relating to Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol
(Agenda sub-item 14(b))

Proceedings

104. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. At its 1st meeting, on a proposal by the Chair, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item jointly with agenda sub-item 14(a) of the SBI and agenda sub-item 9(a) of the SBSTA. At the same meeting, the SBI also agreed that the SBI Chair would undertake consultations with interested Parties on how to take up this sub-item at the next session. At its 2nd meeting, the SBI agreed to continue, at SBI 42, consultations on how to take up this agenda sub-item.

C. Progress on the implementation of decision 1/CP.10
(Agenda sub-item 14(c))

Proceedings

105. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. At its 1st meeting, on a proposal by the Chair, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda sub-item jointly with agenda sub-item 14(a) of the SBI and agenda sub-item 9(a) of the SBSTA. At the same meeting, the SBI also agreed that the SBI Chair would undertake consultations with interested Parties on how to take up this sub-item at the next session. At its 2nd meeting, the SBI agreed to continue, at SBI 42, consultations on how to take up this agenda sub-item.

---

[81] The submissions made by Parties are available on the UNFCCC submission portal at <www.unfccc.int/5900>.

[82] The submissions made by observer organizations are available on the UNFCCC website at <http://unfccc.int/documentation/submissions_from_observers/items/7481.php>.

[83] FCCC/TP/2014/12.

[84] FCCC/SB/2014/INF.4.

[85] For the text as adopted, see decision 20/CP.20.

XV. The 2013–2015 review

(Agenda item 15)

1. Proceedings

106. The SBI considered this agenda item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SB/2014/1 and FCCC/SB/2014/INF.3. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda item jointly with agenda sub-item 8(c) of the SBSTA in a contact group co-chaired by Mr. Leon Charles (Grenada) and Ms. Gertraud Wollansky (Austria). At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[86]

2. Conclusions

107. The SBSTA and the SBI took note of the submissions from Parties of their views on additional inputs to the structured expert dialogue (SED), on how to conclude the 2013–2015 review, and on the final reporting of the SBSTA and the SBI to COP 21,[87] as well as of the summary report on the 3rd meeting of the SED, held from 6 to 8 June 2014 in Bonn.[88]

108. The SBSTA and the SBI welcomed the Synthesis Report of the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),[89] and recognized the usefulness for the 2013–2015 review of the contributions of all IPCC working groups to the AR5.

109. The SBSTA and the SBI also welcomed the 1st meeting of the fourth session of the SED, held on 2 and 3 December 2014 in Lima and looked forward to the resumed fourth session of the SED, which will take place on 8 and 9 February 2015 in Geneva, Switzerland. They further welcomed the progress made by the SED as reported by its co-facilitators to COP 20.[90]

110. The SBSTA and the SBI noted with appreciation the contributions made by the representatives of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the IPCC, the International Energy Agency, the United Nations Environment Programme, the World Bank and the World Health Organization at the 1st meeting of the fourth session of the SED. They also noted with appreciation the financial contributions provided by Belgium, Japan, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the 2013–2015 review.

111. The SBSTA and the SBI:

(a) Took note of, and expressed their appreciation to the secretariat for, the document on national information available for consideration by the SED;[91]

(b) Recalled the conclusions adopted at their fortieth sessions[92] requesting the SED to consider the information sources identified in decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 161, in particular subparagraphs (b–d), at the resumed fourth session of the SED, noting decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 89, with a view to ensuring a balanced consideration of the information referenced in document FCCC/SB/2014/INF.3;

---

[86] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SB/2014/L.9.

[87] The submissions are available at <www.unfccc.int/5900>.

[88] The summary report is available at <http://unfccc.int/files/science/workstreams/the_2013-2015_review/application/pdf/sed3_summary_report.pdf>.

[89] Available at <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/>.

[90] FCCC/SB/2014/1.

[91] FCCC/SB/2014/INF.3.

[92] FCCC/SBSTA/2014/2, paragraph 75, and FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraph 194.

(c) Requested the co-facilitators of the SED to take into account the information contained in this document and the views of Parties referred to in paragraph 107 above and contained in submissions made under this agenda item when preparing for the resumed fourth session of the SED.

112. The SBSTA and the SBI recalled decision 1/CP.17, paragraph 6, and noted paragraph 79 of the report on SBSTA 40[93] reflecting the discussion on how the 2013–2015 review informs the broader UNFCCC process, including the work of its bodies.

113. The SBSTA and the SBI recalled the conclusions adopted at their fortieth sessions[94] and noted the consultations between the co-facilitators of the SED and Parties at SBSTA 41 and SBI 41 on the resumed fourth session of the SED.

114. The SBSTA and the SBI looked forward to the summary report on the fourth session of the SED, to be made available no later than 20 March 2015.

115. The SBSTA and the SBI encouraged the organizations mentioned in paragraph 110 above, as well as other relevant organizations and agencies as referred to in decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 161, to support the future work of the SED, including through consideration of the issues that emerged at previous meetings of the SED, and noted that the resumed fourth session of the SED will be its final meeting.

116. In fulfilment of the mandate given in decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 86(b), the SBSTA and the SBI requested the co-facilitators of the SED to prepare, with the assistance of the secretariat, a final factual report that includes a compilation and a technical summary of the summary reports on the meetings of the SED and to make it available no later than 3 April 2015.

117. The SBSTA and the SBI invited Parties to submit to the secretariat, by 1 May 2015, taking into account the work of the SED and being mindful of decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 91, the following:

(a) Any other information or gaps in information relevant to the 2013–2015 review, in accordance with decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 161, decision 1/CP.18, paragraph 84, and paragraph 132 of the report on SBSTA 39;[95]

(b) Their views on the adequacy of the long-term global goal in the light of the ultimate objective of the Convention and the overall progress made towards achieving the long-term global goal, including a consideration of the implementation of the commitments under the Convention.

118. SBSTA 42 and SBI 42 will consider the report referred to in paragraph 116 above and the submissions from Parties referred to in paragraph 117 above, with a view to informing the COP, which shall take appropriate action based on the 2013–2015 review, in accordance with previous relevant decisions.

XVI. Gender and climate change

(Agenda item 16)

Proceedings

119. The SBI considered this agenda item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/CP/2014/7. Statements were made by representatives of three

[93] FCCC/SBSTA/2014/2.
[94] FCCC/SBSTA/2014/2, paragraphs 77 and 78, and FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraphs 196 and 197.
[95] FCCC/SBSTA/2013/5.

Parties, including one on behalf of the LDCs. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda item in informal consultations co-facilitated by Ms. Portillo and Mr. Shimada.

120. At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI recommended a draft decision[96] on this matter for consideration and adoption at COP 20, and requested the secretariat to inform Parties, at SBI 42, of the existing gender-related policies within the secretariat.[97] At the same meeting, representatives of two Parties, including one speaking on behalf of the LDCs, proposed that the work programme be named the "Lima work programme on gender and climate change".

XVII. Arrangements for intergovernmental meetings

(Agenda item 17)

1. Proceedings

121. The SBI considered this agenda item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SBI/2014/11 and FCCC/SBI/2014/12. At its 1st meeting, the SBI agreed to consider this agenda item in a contact group chaired by the Chair of the SBI. At its resumed 2nd meeting, the SBI considered and adopted the conclusions below.[98]

2. Conclusions

122. The SBI welcomed the views of Parties on the frequency and organization of sessions of the COP, the CMP and their subsidiary bodies.

123. The SBI also welcomed the views of Parties on adjusting the timing of the election of the President of such sessions and options for strengthening coordination between Presidencies.

124. The SBI requested that the secretariat provide further information and analysis on the options for the frequency and organization of sessions outlined in document FCCC/SBI/2014/11. The SBI recommended that this information be further considered at SBI 42.

125. With regard to the frequency and organization of sessions, including the organization of the high-level segment, the SBI noted the views of some Parties on the need to examine the implications of possibly shifting to an implementation mode of work in the intergovernmental process, as well as high-level participation. The SBI recognized the need to take into account the important role of implementation in work after 2015. Furthermore, it noted that additional consideration should be given to enhance coherence between the outcome of COP 21/CMP 11 and organizational arrangements.

126. The SBI recognized the need to take into consideration and further analyse the implications of hosting the COP and CMP sessions, noting that it is a major undertaking and also noting the views of Parties that sessions held at the seat of the secretariat could increase the opportunity for all Parties to serve as President of the COP and the CMP.

127. The SBI proposed that further consideration be given to the organization of high-level segments at future COP and CMP sessions, keeping in mind that ministers should be engaged when political leadership is needed and the considerable resource implications related to their participation. The SBI further proposed the consideration of alternative modes of ministerial engagement during the high-level segment, including those outlined in document FCCC/SBI/2014/11.

---

[96] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.43/Rev.1.

[97] For the text as adopted, see decision 18/CP.20.

[98] Draft conclusions presented in document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.37.

128. The SBI requested the secretariat to provide further information on the scenarios outlined in document FCCC/SBI/2014/11 for consideration at SBI 42. The information should include clarification on the budgetary implications of:

(a) Biennial sessions of the COP and the CMP, as well as of meetings of their subsidiary bodies;

(b) Sessions alternating between a host country and the seat of the secretariat.

129. The information should also outline the implications for the Headquarters Agreement of the secretariat for sessions at venues alternating every year between a host country and the seat of the secretariat.

130. The SBI requested that the secretariat provide further information on and analysis of the options for adjusting the timing of the election of the President, as outlined in document FCCC/SBI/2014/12, including on the rotation of the Presidencies when sessions alternate between a host country and the seat of the secretariat. The SBI agreed to consider this information at SBI 42.

131. With regard to adjusting the timing of the election of the President, the SBI highlighted that the importance of a smooth transition between current and future Presidencies should be kept in mind for future considerations.

132. The SBI reaffirmed the conclusions as contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/8, paragraphs 218–221.

XVIII. Administrative, financial and institutional matters

(Agenda item 18)

A. Audited financial statements for the biennium 2012–2013

(Agenda sub-item 18(a))

Proceedings

133. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it document FCCC/SBI/2014/16 and Add.1. At its 1st meeting, the SBI took note of the document prepared for the session. At the same meeting, the Chair proposed to prepare draft conclusions and draft decisions on this matter, with the assistance of the secretariat and in consultation with interested Parties. At its 2nd meeting, the SBI recommended a draft decision[99] for consideration and adoption at COP 20[100] and a draft decision[101] for consideration and adoption at CMP 10.[102]

B. Budget performance for the biennium 2014–2015

(Agenda sub-item 18(b))

Proceedings

134. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st and 2nd meetings. It had before it documents FCCC/SBI/2014/10 and FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.23. At its 1st meeting, the SBI took note of the documents prepared for the session. At the same meeting, the Chair

[99] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.27.
[100] For the text as adopted, see decision 22/CP.20.
[101] *For the text of the draft decision, see document* FCCC/SBI/2014/L.28.
[102] For the text as adopted, see decision 8/CMP.10.

proposed to prepare draft conclusions and draft decisions on this matter, with the assistance of the secretariat and in consultation with interested Parties. At its 2nd meeting, the SBI recommended a draft decision[103] for consideration and adoption at COP 20[104] and a draft decision[105] for consideration and adoption at CMP 10.[106]

XIX. Reports on other activities

(Agenda item 19)

A. Report on the expert meeting on an information hub for information on the results of the activities referred to in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 70, and results-based payments

(Agenda sub-item 19(a))

Proceedings

135. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting. The SBI took note of the information contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/INF.13 and requested the secretariat to establish the information hub. At the resumed 2nd meeting of the SBI, a representative of one Party proposed that the information hub be named the "Lima REDD information hub". The Chair informed the SBI that he would convey this recommendation to the COP.[107]

B. Summary report on the 2nd Dialogue on Article 6 of the Convention

(Agenda sub-item 19(b))

Proceedings

136. The SBI considered this agenda sub-item at its 1st meeting and took note of the information contained in document FCCC/SBI/2014/15.

XX. Other matters

(Agenda item 20)

1. Proceedings

137. The SBI considered this item at its 1st and resumed 2nd meetings. At its 1st meeting, the SBI acknowledged that the COP had referred to it the issue of membership on the CGE for consideration. At the same meeting, the SBI agreed that the Chair would undertake bilateral consultations with interested Parties on this matter. At the resumed 2nd meeting, the Chair reported on the outcome of the consultations. The SBI agreed that his statement, capturing the outcome of these consultations, would be included in the report on SBI 41. Accordingly, the statement is presented in annex II.

---

[103] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.27.
[104] For the text as adopted, see decision 22/CP.20.
[105] For the text of the draft decision, see document FCCC/SBI/2014/L.28.
[106] For the text as adopted, see decision 8/CMP.10.
[107] See document FCCC/CP/2014/10, paragraph 50.

2. Conclusions

138. The SBI agreed to continue the consideration of this matter at SBI 45 (November 2016), in conjunction with the review by the COP of the mandate and terms of reference of the CGE, in accordance with decision 19/CP.19, paragraph 8.

139. The SBI encouraged a representative of non-Annex I Parties that are not represented on the CGE according to the regional distribution specified in decision 3/CP.8, annex, paragraph 3(a), to continue participating in the work of the CGE in accordance with the conclusions adopted at COP 19.[108]

XXI. Closure of and report on the session
(Agenda item 21)

1. Administrative and budgetary implications

140. At the resumed 2nd meeting, the Executive Secretary provided a preliminary evaluation of the administrative and budgetary implications of the conclusions adopted during the session pursuant to decision 16/CP.9, paragraph 20, whereby the Executive Secretary is to provide an indication of the administrative and budgetary implications of decisions[109] if these cannot be met from existing resources within the core budget.

141. The Executive Secretary informed Parties that a few activities resulting from the negotiations at this session call for further support by the secretariat and, therefore, require additional resources in the coming year over and above the core budget for 2014–2015.

142. Namely, under agenda sub-item 4(c), "provision of financial and technical support", funding in the amount of EUR 575,000 is required for the resources related to travel of participants, logistics, and resource persons for the three regional training workshops planned in 2015. This amount is preliminary and is based on the information available at this time.

2. Closure of and report on the session

143. At the resumed 2nd meeting, closing statements were made by representatives of six Parties, including on behalf of the Umbrella Group, of the European Union and its 28 member States, of EIG, of AOSIS, and of the LDCs. Statements were also made by representatives of environmental NGOs, women and gender NGOs, and youth NGOs.

144. At the 3rd meeting, on 8 December, upon completion of the MA working group session, the SBI adopted the draft report on the session,[110] and authorized the Rapporteur, with the assistance of the secretariat and under the guidance of the Chair, to complete the report on the session and to make it available to all Parties.

145. At the same meeting, a representative of one Party made a statement on behalf of the G77 and China, after which the Chair thanked Parties for their support during this session and closed the session.

---

[108] FCCC/CP/2013/10, paragraph 131.

[109] While decision 16/CP.9 refers to "decisions", it also has implications for the conclusions of the subsidiary bodies.

[110] FCCC/SBI/2014/L.25.

Annex I

[English only]

Summary reports on multilateral assessments at the forty-first session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Background

1. The Conference of the Parties, by decision 1/CP.16, decided that developed country Parties should enhance the reporting in their national communications and submit biennial reports on their progress in achieving emission reductions. It also established a new process under the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) – the international assessment and review (IAR) of emissions and removals related to developed country Parties' quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets – that aims to promote the comparability of efforts among all developed country Parties. The first round of the IAR process is to be conducted during the period 2014–2015.

2. According to the modalities and procedures for IAR specified in annex II to decision 2/CP.17, the multilateral assessment (MA), being part of the IAR process, is to be conducted for each developed country Party at a working group session of the SBI, with the participation of all Parties. The aim of the MA is to assess each Party's progress in implementation towards the achievement of emission reductions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target.

3. The first working group session was convened during SBI 41 under the chairmanship of Mr. Amena Yauvoli (Fiji), the SBI Chair, and was preceded by a three-month period of questions and answers; in the first month, any Party may submit written questions to the Party being assessed, which may respond to the questions within the remaining two months. A summary report for each of the 17 Parties that underwent assessment at SBI 41 is presented below. The reports are also available on the UNFCCC website under those Parties' records.[1]

4. In closing each MA, the SBI Chair reminded Parties that they can submit any other observations on their MA process within two months of the working group session, and that this will form part of their Party record for the MA. The SBI Chair thanked all Parties and the secretariat for each successful MA session.

[1] See <www.unfccc.int/8451>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Austria

1. The first MA of Austria was held on 6 December 2014. Austria was represented by Mr. Helmut Hojesky, Director of the Division for Climate Change and Air Quality of the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management.

2. Questions for Austria had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the United States of America. The United States also submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Austria can be found on the IAR web page for Austria.[1]

3. Mr. Hojesky made an opening presentation, addressing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. He described Austria's greenhouse gas (GHG) emission trends since 1990, highlighting a decoupling of emissions from gross domestic product and population growth and stating that Austria's GHG emissions per capita are close to the European Union (EU) average. Mr. Hojesky elaborated on the national circumstances of Austria as a country located in the heart of Europe, its changing political situation since 1988 and its role as a transit country located at the crossroads between Western and South-Eastern Europe.

4. Mr. Hojesky explained that as an EU member State, Austria is committed to achieving the joint unconditional quantified economy-wide emission reduction target of the EU of 20 per cent by 2020 compared with 1990 levels. He highlighted the country's target of a 16 per cent reduction, by 2020, in emissions not covered by the EU Emissions Trading System (non-ETS). Regarding the progress made towards this target, it was acknowledged that additional measures will be needed. To that effect, Austria is in the process of elaborating a programme, expected to be finalized in 2015, that focuses on transport, buildings and energy supply. A strong emphasis is placed on the increase in the use of renewable energy sources, with the very ambitious target of reaching a 34 per cent share of renewables in the energy mix by 2020. Mr. Hojesky presented emission trends and key drivers for the transport and buildings sectors since 2005, and explained the ongoing decoupling of GHG emissions and economic growth.

5. The opening presentation was followed by further questions from Brazil and China. These questions were on additional domestic policies and measures (PaMs) included in the emission projection scenario for the period ending in 2020 and on EU-wide and domestic planned and additional PaMs in the transport sector. In response to these questions, Austria provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Austria.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-austria-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Croatia

1. The first MA of Croatia was held on 6 December 2014. Croatia was represented by Ms. Visnja Grgasovic, Head of the Service for Climate Change and Ozone Layer Protection, Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection.

2. Questions for Croatia had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China and Egypt. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Croatia can be found on the IAR web page for Croatia.[1]

3. Ms. Grgasovic made an opening presentation, summarizing the progress made by Croatia in implementation towards the achievement of emission reductions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target. Regarding the period 1990–2012, emissions in Croatia decreased in the early 1990s as a consequence of the war in the country, followed by an increase from 1995 onward owing to the economic recovery. Emissions decreased again from 2007 onward owing to the economic crisis. According to Croatia, the emission intensity in 2012 was 20 per cent lower than in 1995, which demonstrates a decoupling of GHG emissions from economic growth.

4. Within the EU framework, Croatia has a target of limiting emission growth in non-ETS sectors to 11 per cent by 2020. In addition, Croatia has a target of increasing the share of renewable energy in gross final energy consumption to 20 per cent by 2020, and an energy efficiency target of a 9 per cent increase in energy savings by 2020 in comparison with the final energy consumption in the period 2001–2005. Ms. Grgasovic outlined the PaMs Croatia has put in place to achieve the targets in renewable energy, energy efficiency and the transport sector by 2020, while acknowledging the challenge it, as a new EU member State, faces in implementing the demanding measures from the EU 2020 climate and energy package.

5. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and questions from Brazil, China and the United States. These were on PaMs for sectors other than the energy sector; the difficulties in reversing the increasing emission trend by 2020 given the efforts already put in place; the relationship between the national emission reduction target and the EU target; the estimation of the quantified mitigation effects of existing and planned PaMs; and separate GHG projections for the emissions in the sectors under the EU Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) and non-ETS sectors. In response, Croatia provided further explanations. Details of these interventions can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Croatia.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-croatia-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Cyprus

1. The first MA of Cyprus was held on 6 December 2014. Cyprus was represented by Mr. Theodoulos Mesimeris, Head of the Climate Action Unit, Department of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment.

2. Questions for Cyprus had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by China, Egypt and the United States. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Cyprus can be found on the IAR web page for Cyprus.[1]

3. Mr. Mesimeris made an opening presentation, summarizing the progress of Cyprus in implementation towards the achievement of emission reductions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. Cyprus has been a Party included in Annex I to the Convention since 2013. Within the EU framework, Cyprus has a target of reducing its emissions from non-ETS sectors by 5 per cent by 2020, compared with the 2005 level. Mr. Mesimeris outlined the national policies of Cyprus and its measures in the energy, transport, agriculture and waste sectors to reduce GHG emissions. According to its GHG emission projections, Cyprus is well on track to achieve its non-ETS sector target by 2020.

4. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and a further clarification question from China. This question was related to the latest GHG inventory of Cyprus, which documents an emission increase of 52 per cent in 2012 compared with the 1990 level. This seemed to contradict the sharp decrease in emissions around 2012 that was depicted in the GHG emission projection chart presented by Cyprus during the MA session. In response, Cyprus provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Cyprus.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-cyprus-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Denmark

1. The first MA of Denmark was held on 6 December 2014. Denmark was represented by Ms. Mercan-Ellen Bodil Kaya Nielsen, Head of Delegation, Danish Energy Agency, Ministry of Climate, Energy and Building.

2. Questions for Denmark had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Brazil, China, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the United States. The United States also submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Denmark can be found on the IAR web page for Denmark.[1]

3. Ms. Nielsen made an opening presentation, summarizing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. She explained that as an EU member State, Denmark is committed to achieving the joint unconditional quantified economy-wide emission reduction target of the EU of 20 per cent by 2020 compared with the 1990 level. Ms. Nielsen described Denmark's decreasing GHG emission trends since 1990 and highlighted the decoupling of emissions from economic growth and energy consumption, the three main reasons for which are: increased use of combined heat and power, increased use of renewable energy sources and energy savings. She elaborated on the assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to Denmark's targets under the first and second commitment periods of the Kyoto Protocol and under the Convention, highlighting Denmark's domestic target of a 40 per cent reduction in GHG emissions by 2020 and its ambitious domestic energy targets of more than 35 per cent share of renewable energy in final energy consumption and of approximately 50 per cent of electricity consumption supplied by wind power generation, both by 2020.

4. Regarding the progress made by Denmark towards its target, Ms. Nielsen confirmed that it will achieve its 21 per cent reduction target for 2008–2012 as its contribution to the joint EU target for the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. Moreover, Denmark expects to achieve its 20 per cent reduction target for 2020 in emissions in non-ETS sectors and stay below the target path for 2013–2020. This will be achieved through existing measures and further implementation of adopted PaMs. Finally, Ms. Nielsen emphasized that Denmark's target of a 20 per cent reduction in emissions in non-ETS sectors by 2020 is one of the more ambitious targets among those of EU member States.

5. The opening presentation was followed by further questions from Brazil and China. These questions were on the existence of specific policies for improving the sharing of experience on the diffusion of renewable energy technologies and on technology transfer and of policies for improving this information and technology sharing; and the possibility of showing the share in Denmark's target of emission reductions in non-ETS sectors by 2020 compared with the 1990 level. In response, Denmark provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Denmark.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-denmark-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of the European Union

1. The first MA of the EU was held on 6 December 2014. The EU was represented by Ms. Elina Bardram, Head of Unit, International and Inter-Institutional Relations, Directorate-General for Climate Action.

2. Questions for the EU had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, Japan, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia and the United States. The United States also submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of questions received and the answers provided by the EU can be found on the IAR web page for the EU.[1]

3. Ms. Bardram made an opening presentation, addressing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. She outlined the EU joint unconditional and conditional quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets for 2020 under the Convention, as well as its binding commitment under the Kyoto Protocol for the second commitment period. Ms. Bardram also described the progress made by the EU in meeting its pledge under the Convention and its Kyoto Protocol commitments. Based on the data provided by the EU, its estimated 2013 GHG emissions were 19 per cent below 1990 levels. In addition, the EU projects that its GHG emissions in 2020, on the basis of existing PaMs, will be 21 per cent below the 1990 level.

4. Ms. Bardram elaborated on the contributions of individual member States to the EU 2020 target for emissions from non-ETS sectors under the effort-sharing decision.[2] In addition, she stated that the EU has been able to decouple economic growth and GHG emissions; from 1990 to 2012, the EU gross domestic product increased by 45 per cent, while GHG emissions decreased by 18 per cent.

5. Regarding the PaMs utilized to achieve the targets of the EU, Ms. Bardram referred to the climate and energy package, which includes binding EU GHG emission reduction targets for EU ETS and non-ETS sectors; a binding EU renewable energy target combined with member State binding targets; and a non-binding energy efficiency target. In addition, she highlighted that GHG emission reductions that have occurred since 2005 can be attributed to the reduced energy intensity of the economy, the reduced carbon intensity of energy use and the economic recession.

6. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and further questions from Australia, Brazil, China, India, Saudi Arabia, South Africa and the United States. These questions were on the additional efforts that the EU will need to make to transition from the current 20 per cent emission reduction target to the conditional 30 per cent target; the assessment of the progress of individual EU countries in achieving their targets; the effectiveness of PaMs that are implemented to help individual EU member States' reach their targets; the inclusion of land use, land-use change and forestry in the conditional and unconditional targets of the EU for 2020; the progress towards achievement of the EU renewable energy target and the types of renewable energy sources being used; and the use of international credits to achieve the targets. Questions were also raised in relation to the EU approach to measuring the responsiveness of the social and economic consequences of its mitigation actions. In response, the EU provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for the EU.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-eu-full.pdf>.

[2] The effort-sharing decision is part of the of EU climate and energy package.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Finland

1. The first MA of Finland was held on 6 December 2014. Finland was represented by Mr. Harri Laurikka, Chief Negotiator of the Ministry of the Environment of Finland.

2. Questions for Finland had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by China, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The United States submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Finland can be found on the IAR web page for Finland.[1]

3. Mr. Laurikka made an opening presentation, summarizing Finland's progress in implementation towards the achievement of emission reductions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction targets. Emissions excluding the land use, land-use change and forestry sector decreased between 1990 and 2012 in Finland, with an annual decrease in both the emission intensity of the economy and emissions per capita over the same period. The use of bioenergy more than doubled during this period, which contributed to replacing fossil fuels in the energy supply. According to Mr. Laurikka, Finland is estimated to overachieve its target in the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol by 13.5 Mt of carbon dioxide equivalent. Finland is also prepared to ratify the Doha Amendment in order to implement its emission reduction commitment for the period 2013–2020.

4. Mr. Laurikka presented Finland's targets by 2020 at a disaggregated level, covering targets for EU ETS and non-ETS sectors, renewable energy, biofuels in transport and improvements in energy efficiency. Based on current GHG emission projections, Finland is on track to meet these targets. Key PaMs are in place to ensure the achievement of the target for 2020 and beyond, including the national energy and climate strategy and a road map on climate and energy policy up to 2050. In addition, the Climate Change Act was prepared and presented to the Parliament in June 2014.

5. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and questions from China, Brazil and the United States. These questions were on the additional efforts that Finland will need to make in order to transition from the current 20 per cent emission reduction target to the conditional 30 per cent target; the current share of renewable energy sources (RES) in the energy mix, as an indication of whether Finland is on track to meet its 2020 RES target; actions related to the National Forest Programme. Moreover, further explanation was demanded on why the land sector is not included in the 2020 target given the significance of this sector in the Finnish economy. In response, Finland provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Finland.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-finland-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of France

1. The first MA of France was held on 6 December 2014. France was represented by Mr Paul Watkinson from the Ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement Durable et de l'Energie.

2. Questions for France had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Algeria, China, Egypt, Japan, Saudi Arabia and the United States. The United States also submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of questions received and the answers provided by France can be found on the IAR web page for France.[1]

3. Mr. Watkinson made an opening presentation, summarizing France's approaches to and successes in reducing GHG emissions and achieving its targets. He referred to France's 2020 targets under the Convention and the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol, and, as a member State of the EU, to its contribution to the joint targets of the EU. Information was also provided on the EU 2030 climate and energy package and France's 2050 emission reduction target. Mr. Watkinson provided information on France's total GHG emissions and its emissions by sector in 2012 relative to the respective base years and highlighted the progress made by the Party towards its targets.

4. Mr. Watkinson described the main policies put in place by France before 2012 and presented a set of new policies adopted since its elaboration of GHG emission projections up until 2020, including the pre-2012 measures. These new adopted policies target the buildings, energy production and distribution, agriculture and research sectors. At the EU level, the newly adopted policies concern the EU ETS 'backloading'[2] and fluorinated gases (F–gases).

5. The opening presentation was followed by questions from Brazil, China, Saudi Arabia and the United States. These questions were on the peaking of GHG emissions in France in 1978; the clarification of France's national 2020 target combining the targets for emissions from EU ETS and non-ETS sectors; the EU conditional 30 per cent target; the land sector not being included in the EU 2020 target and the related impact on France in terms of it achieving the target; the role of the EU ETS and the role of units from Kyoto Protocol and market-based mechanisms in achieving the 2020 target; and France's plan for additional PaMs in the electricity sector. A question was also raised on France's national approach to assessing the impacts of PaMs on developing countries. In response, France provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for France.

[1] <http://www.unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-france-full.pdf>.

[2] "Backloading" refers to the postponement by the European Commission of the auctioning of 900 million allowances until 2019–2020 to allow demand to pick up.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Italy

1. The first MA of Italy was held on 6 December 2014. Italy was represented by Mr. Gaudioso, Expert, Institute for Environmental Protection and Research.

2. Questions for Italy had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Algeria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, China, Egypt, Japan, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia and the United States. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Italy can be found on the IAR web page for Italy.[1]

3. Mr. Gaudioso made an opening presentation, addressing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. He described Italy's quantified economy-wide emission reduction target and its progress in achieving the target and elaborated on the declining trend of GHG emissions and the drivers behind this trend. Also, Mr. Gaudioso emphasized the country's major PaMs, in particular in the areas of renewable energy consumption and energy efficiency.

4. Mr. Gaudioso explained that as an EU member State, Italy is committed to achieving the joint unconditional quantified economy-wide emission reduction target of the EU of 20 per cent by 2020 compared with the 1990 level. He highlighted that Italy is on track to meet its target of a 26 per cent reduction by 2020 compared to the 2005 level in non-ETS sector emissions.

5. The opening presentation was followed by further questions from Australia, Brazil, China and the United States. These questions were on the types of renewable energy sources (RES) used by Italy to achieve its RES target; the current level of GHG emissions from sectors covered by the EU ETS; the drivers of the increase in energy generation from photovoltaic cells; the experience gained in implementing PaMs in the energy efficiency and transport sectors; and the role of units from market-based mechanisms in achieving the quantified economy-wide emission reduction target. In response to these questions, Italy provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Italy.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-italy-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Latvia

1. The first MA of Latvia was held on 6 December 2014. Latvia was represented by Ms. Alda Ozola, Deputy State Secretary, Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development.

2. A question for Latvia had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by the China. The question received and the answer provided by Latvia can be found on the IAR web page for Latvia.[1]

3. Ms. Ozola made an opening presentation, summarizing Latvia's progress in implementation towards the achievement of emission reductions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target. Latvia's emissions have significantly decreased since 1990: by 58 per cent below the 1990 level during the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. The emission decrease is not only due to the transition from a centrally planned economy to a market economy in the early 1990s, but also to the switch to less carbon-intensive fuels and the decarbonization of the energy mix in Latvia.

4. Within the EU framework, Latvia has a target of limiting emission growth in non-ETS sectors to 17 per cent by 2020 compared with the 2005 level. This target is challenging given the large share of emissions from non-ETS sectors in Latvia. However, Latvia has put a number of policy tools in place to achieve the target, including regulatory measures within the EU framework, feed-in tariffs and investment support programmes aimed at increasing the share of renewables, and energy efficiency measures, as well as PaMs in the transport, agriculture and waste management sectors. According to its 2013 GHG emission projections, in the scenario with additional measures, Latvia will limit emission growth in non-ETS sectors to 14.8 per cent by 2020.

5. The opening presentation was followed by questions from Australia, Brazil, China and Pakistan. These questions were on the projected trend of the share of renewable energy sources in energy generation and factors affecting that trend; the operation of Latvia's Green Investment Fund and Green Public Procurement scheme; the plan to meet the challenge of emission reductions in EU ETS sectors; and the plan to meet the 2020 target given the increasing emission trend during the period 2005–2013. In response to these questions, Latvia provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Latvia.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-latvia-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Luxembourg

1. The first MA of Luxembourg was held on 6 December 2014. Luxembourg was represented by Mr. Eric de Brabanter from the Département de l'Environnement in the Ministère du Développement Durable et des Infrastructures.

2. Questions for Luxembourg had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The United States submitted a written question after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Luxembourg can be found on the IAR web page for Luxembourg.[1]

3. Mr. de Brabanter made an opening presentation, summarizing Luxembourg's targets for, approaches to and successes in reducing GHG emissions, as well as the progress it has made towards achieving its targets. He outlined Luxembourg's national circumstances most relevant to its GHG emissions, as well as its GHG emission trends and emission intensity related indicators. He also provided information on Luxembourg's total GHG emissions and emissions by sector in 2012.

4. Mr. de Brabanter further reported on Luxembourg's progress towards the achievement of its target under the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and its need to use units from the clean development and joint implementation mechanisms. Regarding Luxembourg's 2020 targets, Mr. de Brabanter reiterated its commitments under the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, as well as its targets as an EU member State contributing to the 2020 targets of the EU.

5. Mr. de Brabanter presented projections up to 2020 of Luxembourg's GHG emissions in the 'with additional measures' scenario from non-ETS sectors. He mentioned Luxembourg's package of 51 additional policies that are to be implemented to help bridge the gap to its 2020 targets. He acknowledged that Luxembourg will likely need to use units from market-based mechanisms to achieve its targets.

6. The opening presentation was followed by questions from Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Fiji and the United States. These questions were on the types of PaMs in non-ETS sectors, in particular in the buildings and transportation sectors, and their roles in achieving Luxembourg's 2020 target and modifying longer-term trends in GHG emissions; the quantitative effect of individual PaMs and the identification of those with the greatest effect on GHG emission reductions, in particular PaMs targeting non-ETS sectors; plans regarding the implementation of additional PaMs in order to achieve the target; how Luxembourg plans to attribute GHG emissions from transiting road freight transport in future GHG emission projections; the use and accounting of different units from Kyoto Protocol mechanisms and market-based mechanisms in achieving the target, as well as on the contribution of these units compared with reductions realized by PaMs; and on GHG emission reductions for the period 1990–1999. A question was also raised on the impacts of Luxembourg's PaMs on small island developing States. In response to these and further questions, Luxembourg provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Luxembourg.

[1] <http://www.unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-luxembourg-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of the Netherlands

1. The first MA of the Netherlands was held on 8 December 2014. The Netherlands was represented by Mr. Ivo de Zwaan, Head of Delegation, Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment of the Netherlands.

2. Questions for the Netherlands had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Brazil, China, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the United States. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by the Netherlands can be found on the IAR web page for the Netherlands.[1]

3. Mr. de Zwaan made an opening presentation, summarizing the progress of the Netherlands in implementation towards the achievement of emission reductions and removals related to its quantified economy-wide emission reduction target. According to the 2014 annual GHG inventory submission of the Netherlands, emissions excluding the land use, land-use change and forestry sector were 9.5 per cent lower in 2012 than in 1990. The Netherlands will achieve its target for the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol without the use of credits from market-based mechanisms.

4. Within the EU framework, the Netherlands has a target of reducing emissions from non-ETS sectors by 16 per cent by 2020 compared with the 2005 level. In 2011, this overall non-ETS target was translated into more specific sectoral targets for 2020, further divided, within each sector, into carbon dioxide (CO_2) and non-CO_2 targets. According to its GHG emission projections, with additional measures, the Netherlands is on track to achieve its 2020 and 2030 targets. Mr. de Zwaan provided some examples in the Netherlands of broad-based coalitions for the implementation of climate policies, such as the long-term agreements on energy efficiency, green deals, the energy agreement for sustainable growth and the Dutch climate coalition.

5. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and questions from Brazil, Canada, China, Fiji, Saudi Arabia and the United States. These questions were on the disaggregation of sectors reported for GHG emissions that is different from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change guidelines; the Netherlands's experience with energy sector subsidies, especially in the context of promotion of renewable energy sources; the expected impacts of the national carbon capture and storage strategy; the compatibility of the 2020 emission reduction targets under the Convention and the target for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol; the potential sectoral contribution to the move from a 20 per cent emission reduction target to a conditional 30 per cent reduction target; and the decision-making process in implementing PaMs that supplement EU ETS sectors. A point was also raised on the Netherlands's Delta Works. In response, the Netherlands provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for the Netherlands.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-netherlands-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of New Zealand

1. The first MA of New Zealand was held on 8 December 2014. New Zealand was represented by Ms. Jo Tyndall, Climate Change Ambassador, Environment Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade.

2. Questions for New Zealand had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Brazil, China, Egypt, the EU, Japan, Saudi Arabia and the United States. The United States also submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by New Zealand can be found on the IAR web page for New Zealand.[1]

3. Ms. Tyndall made an opening presentation, addressing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. She described New Zealand's unconditional target of a 5 per cent emission reduction by 2020 compared with the 1990 level. This target is equivalent to a quantified emission limitation or reduction objective of 96.8 over the period 2013–2020, and is thus considered more ambitious than the target for the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. She emphasized that New Zealand plans to achieve the target through a combination of measures, which include domestic emission reductions, the removal of carbon dioxide by forests, participation in international carbon markets and recognition of a surplus achieved during the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol. She stated that this approach is consistent with Kyoto Protocol rules and that the country is confident that it is well on track to achieve its unconditional target.

4. In addition, she elaborated on New Zealand's approach to measuring its progress, which will be consistent with Kyoto Protocol rules, in particular regarding the establishment of a carbon budget for the period 2013–2020 and the application of an activity-based approach for contributions from land use, land-use change and forestry. Regarding individual PaMs and their effects, Ms. Tyndall explained that New Zealand's emissions trading scheme is considered to have the greatest effect. She highlighted the difficulties in estimating the effects of individual PaMs owing to the top-down approach used for the projections, which implicitly include the effects of PaMs. She also explained that at the moment it is difficult to determine the scale of contribution of units from market-based mechanisms to the achievement of New Zealand's target.

5. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and questions from Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, the EU, Fiji, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden and the United States. These questions were on New Zealand's conditional target of a 10–20 per cent emission reduction by 2020 compared with the 1990 level and its consistency with the findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; the consideration of impacts on small island developing States; the understanding of the potential importance of the measures under consideration; details of the emissions trading scheme, including the setting of the cap, the inclusion of agriculture and forestry; the contribution of certain PaMs to closing the gap to the 2020 target; further information on PaMs related to agriculture; whether projections take into account the renewable energy target and the current share of renewables in the energy mix; details of land-use accounting; the intention to use certified emission reductions, keeping in mind New Zealand is not a Party with a target for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol; and further information on common metrics used. In response, New Zealand provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for New Zealand.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-newzealand-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Portugal

1. The first MA of Portugal was held on 8 December 2014. Portugal was represented by Mr. Paulo Canaveira, Senior Advisor of the Portuguese Environment Agency/Portuguese Carbon Fund.

2. Questions for Portugal had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Brazil, China, Egypt and Saudi Arabia. The United States submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Portugal can be found on the IAR web page for Portugal.[1]

3. Mr. Canaveira made an opening presentation, summarizing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. Mr. Canaveira described Portugal's GHG emission trends for 1990–2012, in particular, the significant decreasing trend since 2005, and highlighted the decoupling of emissions from economic growth, which is mainly due to the increased use of renewable energy sources in the country. Mr. Canaveira explained that as a EU member State, Portugal is committed to achieving the joint unconditional quantified economy-wide emission reduction target of the EU of 20 per cent by 2020 compared with the 1990 level. He elaborated on Portugal's targets under the first and second commitment periods of the Kyoto Protocol, highlighting its overachievement for the first commitment period of 17 per cent below the target.

4. Portugal expects to achieve a 25 per cent reduction in emissions by 2020 below the 2005 level in the sectors covered by the EU ETS and to achieve a 40 per cent reduction in emissions by 2020 below the 2005 level in non-ETS sectors. This will be achieved through further implementation of adopted and new PaMs within the framework of Portugal's green growth strategy. Mr. Canaveira emphasized Portugal's National Programme for Climate Change, National Plan for Energy Efficiency and National Plan for Renewable Energy, among other measures and actions addressing other sectors of the economy. These programmes and plans will allow Portugal to achieve more stringent national targets in reference to the EU target of a 21 per cent share of energy from renewable sources in final energy consumption by 2020 and 40 per cent by 2030, and to improve energy efficiency by 25 per cent by 2020 and 30 per cent by 2030 in comparison with the 'business as usual' scenario.

5. The opening presentation was followed by a further question and interventions from Australia and Brazil. The question was on Portugal's expectations on any specific policies to enhance the potential of solar energy, which currently has a relative small contribution to the primary energy sources in the country. In response, Portugal provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Portugal.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-portugal-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Spain

1. The first MA of Spain was held on 8 December 2014. Spain was represented by Mr. Eduardo Gonzalez, Deputy Director for Climate Actions Coordination of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment.

2. Questions for Spain had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Algeria, China, Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the United States. Egypt and the United States submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Spain can be found on the IAR web page for Spain.[1]

3. Mr. Gonzalez made an opening presentation, summarizing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. He described Spain's national circumstances and explained its GHG emission trends since 1990, in particular, the significant decreasing trend since 2007, and highlighted the decrease in the emission intensity of the gross domestic product and the per capita emissions in the country in recent years. He emphasized that the decoupling of emissions from economic growth since 2005 is mainly due to PaMs focused on electricity generation, use of renewable energy sources and improved building codes in the country. Mr. Gonzalez explained that as an EU member State, Spain is committed to achieving the joint unconditional quantified economy-wide emission reduction target of the EU of 20 per cent by 2020, compared with the 1990 level. He elaborated on Spain's target for the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and highlighted Spain's target under the EU effort-sharing decision of a 10 per cent reduction below the 2005 level by 2020 in emissions in non-ETS sectors, including Spain's national targets on the use of renewable energy sources and energy efficiency improvements by 2020.

4. Mr. Gonzalez also provided details of assumptions, conditions and methodologies related to Spain's target under the Convention, and explained the shift in the climate strategy implemented in order to comply with the European and international commitments in the medium and long term and to promote a low-carbon, resource-efficient and inclusive economy. In particular, he explained Spain's "roadmap 2020" for non-ETS sectors, which addresses the gap in compliance with the emissions reduction target for these sectors, and the new PaMs implemented after 2012 at the EU and domestic level addressing other sectors of the economy.

5. The opening presentation was followed by further questions from Brazil, China, New Zealand and Pakistan. These questions were on the drivers that would lead to increases in emissions from the current levels to the 2020 levels in the different projection scenarios presented by Spain; the provision of more information on the tax on F-gases and its expected effect on future F-gas emissions; the reason for taxing only F-gases, which are substances with short lifetime in the atmosphere; the specific PaMs in place in the period 2004–2005 that helped to start a sharp decrease in emissions and emission reductions in the years that followed; and Spain's expectations of very high emission reductions as a result of the adoption of recently proposed measures that were not included in the projection scenarios for 2020, which currently show an increase in emissions. In response, Spain provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Spain.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-spain-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Sweden

1. The first MA of Sweden was held on 8 December 2014. Sweden was represented by Ms. Anna Lindstedt, Ambassador for Climate Change, Ministry of the Environment.

2. Questions for Sweden had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia. The United States submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Sweden can be found on the IAR web page for Sweden.[1]

3. Ms. Lindstedt made an opening presentation, and provided an overview of Sweden's sixth national communication by addressing its national circumstances; GHG emission trends; PaMs, including the most effective ones; the total effect of implemented PaMs; GHG emission projections up to 2025; GHG emission targets under the Convention, the Kyoto Protocol and domestically; and progress towards achieving the targets.

4. Ms. Lindstedt also presented the decreasing trend of total GHG emissions since 1990, mainly due to early implementation of comprehensive climate policies, including a general tax on carbon dioxide in 1991. She highlighted Sweden's emission trends by presenting the results of an analysis of the effect of the implemented PaMs, which include the finding that Sweden's emissions would have increased by some 20 per cent compared with 1990 levels if no climate PaMs had been implemented.

5. Ms. Lindstedt underlined that as a result of its climate policy, Sweden is on track to overachieve its international and domestic emission reduction targets while maintaining robust economic growth since 1990.

6. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and questions from Brazil, Canada, China and Pakistan. These questions were on: emission reductions per sector during the first commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol and in Sweden's projection scenarios; mitigation effects of PaMs in the land sector; mitigation effects of PaMs in Sweden's projection scenarios; and Sweden's mitigation pathway towards its domestic 2050 mitigation target. In response, Sweden provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Sweden.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-sweden-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of Switzerland

1. The first MA of Switzerland was held on 8 December 2014. Switzerland was represented by Mr. Franz Perrez, Head of Delegation, Federal Office for the Environment.

2. Questions for Switzerland had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Algeria, Brazil, China, Egypt, the EU, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand and Saudi Arabia. The United States submitted written questions after the deadline. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by Switzerland can be found on the IAR web page for Switzerland.[1]

3. Mr. Perrez made an opening presentation, addressing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. He explained that Switzerland has a national quantified economy-wide emission reduction target of 20 per cent by 2020, compared with the 1990 level. He also outlined the national circumstances of Switzerland by providing the trends of some key indicators, such as population and gross domestic product, all of which strongly increased between 1990 and 2012, unlike greenhouse gas emissions, which decreased by 3 per cent in this period. This has resulted in a substantial decrease in emissions per gross domestic product, by 28 per cent, and in a decrease in emissions per capita of 18 per cent, with the latter equalling the global average in 2012.

4. Mr. Perrez further elaborated on Switzerland's key emitting sectors (buildings and transport), and explained that while emissions per square metre decreased significantly owing to implemented PaMs, the Party could not yet achieve a full decoupling of emissions in the transport sector. He explained that the expected effects of Switzerland's key PaMs (carbon dioxide levy, emissions trading system, regulations, agreements, building programme and domestic emission compensations) will not be sufficient to meet its target and that additional measures will need to be implemented, including through international efforts.

5. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and questions from Australia, Austria, Brazil, Canada and China. These questions were on the relation between the target under the Convention and that under the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol; the difficulties encountered with adopting the conditional target of a 30 per cent emission reduction by 2020 compared with the 1990 level; the kind of additional PaMs that could be put in place to achieve that target; the intention to use carbon credits from international market-based mechanisms to achieve the target; the progress of shifting freight transport to rail; details of measures in the transport and building sectors; and whether Switzerland has in place a long-term target for emissions from the electricity sector. In response, Switzerland provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for Switzerland.

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41-switzerland-full.pdf>.

Summary report on the multilateral assessment of the United States of America

1. The first MA of the United States was held on 8 December 2014. The United States was represented by Mr. Richard Duke, Deputy Director of the White House Office of Energy and Climate Change.

2. Questions for the United States had been submitted in writing two months before the working group session by Algeria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, China, Egypt, the EU, Japan, Malaysia, New Zealand, Saudi Arabia and Sweden. A list of the questions received and the answers provided by the United States can be found on the IAR web page for the United States.[1]

3. Mr. Duke made an opening presentation, addressing the questions received prior to the working group session and the answers provided. He provided information on the institutional arrangements made by the United States, the progress to date in achieving its 2020 emission reduction target, and the additional PaMs put in place since the publication of its first biennial report. Mr. Duke explained that in 2009, the United States made a commitment to reduce GHG emissions in the range of 17 per cent below the 2005 level by 2020. According to the emission projections reported in its first biennial report, the United States expects to be on track to achieve its target. To do so, the United States has put in place PaMs across all sectors and addressing all GHGs.

4. Mr. Duke highlighted the progress the United States has made in the implementation of its federal and non-federal PaMs, in particular, the introduction of fuel economy standards, appliance efficiency standards, building codes and private sector innovation. The most prominent progress has been achieved through the promotion of electricity generation from wind and solar power, which more than doubled from 2009 to 2012, the shift from coal to natural gas, largely in the power sector, and the clean power plant programme addressing carbon pollution standards for new and existing power plants. He also highlighted the state, local and city actions to achieve GHG emission reduction targets and renewable energy and energy efficiency goals.

5. Mr. Duke discussed the impact of the investments the United States has made in innovation and clean energy research. Through the Recovery Act, the Department of Energy has invested more than USD 80 billion to support a wide range of clean energy projects across the nation. He mentioned the SunShot Initiative, electric bus batteries, biofuel production, and the promotion of energy efficiency and renewable energy.

6. The opening presentation was followed by interventions and questions from Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, the EU, Fiji, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. These questions were on the level of ambition of the 2020 emission reduction target of the United States and associated uncertainties relating to the target emission range and the role of land use, land-use change and forestry; consistency with the assessments of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; emission reduction targets for 2025 and 2030; the description of emission projection scenarios; factors driving emissions; peaking years in emission trends; assessment of the impact of the financial crisis on emission trends; estimation of the effect of PaMs; additional information on specific PaMs such as the Clean Power Plan programme, biofuel production and the use of shale natural gas; planned and ongoing PaMs addressing methane and perfluorocarbon emissions; interplay and complementarity of federal and non-federal PaMs; and the role of public consultation. In addition, questions were raised on actions to address the vulnerability of small islands developing States and on

[1] <http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/biennial_reports_and_iar/international_assessment_and_review/application/pdf/sbi41_-usa-full.pdf>.

the global warming potential values to be used for reporting on emission trends in the second biennial report. In response, the United States provided further explanations. Details can be found in the webcast of this session on the IAR web page for the United States.

Annex II

[English only]

Statement made by the Chair of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at the resumed 2nd meeting on the outcome of his consultations on the issue of membership on the Consultative Group of Experts

"At the opening plenary of the SBI, I expressed my intention to convene bilateral consultations with interested Parties on this matter and report back to the SBI plenary on the results of these consultations.

Colleagues, over the last four days, I have held consultations with Parties to obtain their views on this matter. During those discussions, Parties acknowledged that all Parties should have the opportunity to be represented on the CGE. This will ensure inclusiveness and full participation of all Parties in the climate change process.

Parties also expressed sympathy that non-Annex I Parties from the Eastern Europe Group are not represented on the CGE.

Parties also noted that the issue of membership should be addressed in the broader context of transparency, the right for all Parties to have full CGE membership, the need for inclusiveness, and a balanced representation among Parties.

At the conclusion of the discussions this morning, Parties agreed that the SBI will continue the consideration of this matter at SBI 45 together with the review by the COP of the mandate and terms of reference of the CGE in accordance with decision 19/CP.19.

It was also agreed that a representative of non-Annex I Parties from the Eastern European Group is encouraged to continue participating in the work of the CGE in accordance with the conclusions adopted at COP 19.

Parties also agreed that this approach will provide time and opportunity for Parties to continue consultation among each other to deepen the understanding of different positions and bridge the gap. It will ensure that this group of affected Parties will continue to have opportunity to participate in the work of the CGE.

This statement will be reflected in the report.

I trust that Parties are in agreement with this conclusion. I hear no objections; it is so decided."